

## GENETIC APPROACHES TO THE STATE CATEGORY

**Valentin Ya. Lyubashits***Doctor of Law, Professor**Head of the Department of Theory and History of State and Law**Southern Federal University**kafedra\_tgp@mail.ru***Nikolay V. Razuvaev***Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Civil and Labor Law, North-Western Institute of  
Management of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Service**niko.m\_2002@mail.ru***Valentin G. Medvedev***Doctor of Law, Head of the Department of Theory and History of State and Law**«Togliatti State University»**E-mail: ip@tltsu.ru***Olga A. Kurilkina***Candidate of Law, Associate Professor**Taganrog Institute named after A.P. Chekhov (branch) FSBEI HE "RGEU (RINH)"**e-mail: olga-kurilkina@yandex.ru***Rusanova I. O.***PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Organization of Judicial and Law-Enforcement Bodies, Yaroslav Mudry  
National Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine**e-mail: ss.shestopal@yandex.ru*

**Abstract.** The article analyzes various functional paradigms of the state, which will help to reveal the essential, organic aspect of a state-organized society existence. A state of any historical type implements itself in activity and, therefore, has a functional basis in which the unchanging is embodied that is inherent in it at all stages of evolution. Universal functions implement the essential characteristics of a state as an institutional expression of activities aimed at "common affair" solution. A functionally organized state embodies a certain type of activity that satisfies the need for self-preservation and purposeful organization. Therefore, the functional approach to the study of the state phenomenon allows us to reveal the most important properties belonging to all states, at any evolution stage in which the social purpose of the state as such and, ultimately, its objective (essential) and subjective meaning is manifested.

**Keywords:** Functions of the State, Evolution of the State, Statehood, Political Society, Historical forms of the State, Essence and legal nature of the State, State purpose.

## 1. Introduction

Defining the functions of the state, G. Jellinek distinguishes "material" functions as "the main directions of state activity" and "formal" ones, i.e. "the functions of certain groups of authorities." The former is considered by it as the state functions, which are "conditioned ... by the fact that the activities of the state are aimed at its goal achievement" (Jellinek, G. 2004). From this point of view, the functions of the state are the means of state certain goal achievement. At the same time G. Jellinek sought to separate the functions of the state from the content of his activities and reduce them only to external and formal manifestations of power. He believed that "a specific content of the state activities can always be determined only empirically, and moreover only for an individual state at the moment of its existence." Therefore, in his opinion, "all attempts to give an exhaustive picture of state power by simply enumerating its functions in terms of their content" are certainly unscientific (Jellinek, G. 2004). The functions of an object are an external manifestation of its properties, modes of behavior in a particular system of relations. Therefore, the knowledge of functions is a prerequisite for knowing the main and determining in the state, revealing its social meaning, what it represents itself, in contrast to other social phenomena, in other words, its essence. Secondly, the importance of the issue concerning state functions is conditioned by the fact that the functions determine its structure, i.e. the ways, the patterns of organization of elements of the state as a complex social system. The structure of any system (biological, technical or social one) is determined by its functions. Let's pay attention to the fact that the content of the concept of "state function" can be revealed through the following judgments:

- it is a scientific abstraction, through which a unified state activity is divided into species. They differ by the nature of an object, an immediate goal, the forces, the material and technical means, the methods and, as a consequence, by the activity product;

- State functions are not fundamentally the activities that are unique to the state. Along with the state, similar activities can be carried out by non-governmental organizations. Thus, all the links in the political system of society are based on similar and, finally, general functions. This phenomenon can be called a functional monism in the organization of public life;

- The specifics of the state functions consists in the fact that it gives them a universally binding character as an organ of political power;

- State functions are characterized by relative constancy. At the same time, it goes without saying that different social and political tasks can be solved within the same function and the same set. The features of functions are determined by the needs of political domination of a given class or a social group in a given historical epoch;

- The state realizes its social purpose through functions;

- The states of different historical types have similar functions from the organizational and the technical point of view (but not identical). Such a similarity in the functions of states which is opposite to the essence of states is an objective prerequisite for both their limited mutually beneficial cooperation (there is a partial temporary coincidence of some goals) and the confrontation between them (the bases of struggle are developed);

- The functions of the state include not only those activities that directly serve its social purpose, but also those that perform this role indirectly;

- The concept of function is not related either to the degree of development, the scale or "specific gravity" of a particular activity, nor to the availability of an appropriate specialized link in a state apparatus, it is sufficient for the very fact that such activity is performed by the state;

- Each function of the state should be considered as an element of a single system of functions, outside the system the concept of function has no real meaning (Lyubashits V.Ya. 1993; Díaz-Barrios, Jazmín, Morela Pereira-Burgos, and Wendolin Suárez-Amaya. 2018 ).

It should be noted that there are significant differences in literature concerning the approaches to the definition of state function concept. And the point here is not only and not so much that the semantic translation of the Latin word "functio" was taken as the basis of some theoretical research, while ignoring the methodological and philosophical interpretation of it. Rather, the variety of definitions of the state function concept is largely conditioned by the expansion and the deepening of the methodological basis of state theory on the basis of the greater use of private research methods. This can be traced, for example, via the evolution of the philosophical interpretation of the very concept of function. So, at the turn of the 60-70-ies of the twentieth century, a function was understood as "the mode of behavior inherent in an object and contributing to the preservation of this object or the system existence into which it enters" (Philosophical Encyclopaedia 1970). On this basis, L.I. Kask wrote: "The function of an object is an external manifestation of its properties, the ways of its behavior in a certain system of relations" (Khazal, A. W., Sari, A. M., & Jun, W. X. 2016). And in the late 80-ies you can find another interpretation of this concept: "Function is the ratio of two (group) of objects, in which the change of one of them is accompanied by the change in the other. The function can be considered from the point of view of the consequences (favorable, unfavorable - dysfunctional or neutral - non-functional), caused by the change of one parameter in other parameters of an object (functionality), or from the point of view of individual parts interconnection within the framework of some whole (functioning)" (Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary M., 1989). In the first, earlier definition, the emphasis is on the external manifestation of object properties, the "mode" of its behavior, in the second, later one - on the "relation" between the objects, i.e. the essential aspect of the function is emphasized. Thus, the functions of the state can be defined as the main directions of its activities in the management of society, including the mechanism of state influence on the development of social processes, in which its essence and social purpose is expressed.

## 2. Methods and materials

A fundamental tradition in dealing with the stated problems is in the British school of functionalism. Not accidentally, its prominent representatives - B. Malinovsky, A. Radcliffe-Brown, E. Evans-Prichard - were at the root of political anthropology. In 1940, three books were published, which gave the analysis of the political systems and the institutions of power of archaic African societies. This is the collection of "African political systems" edited by M. Fortes and E. Evans-Pritchard and two books of the latter - "The Political Organization of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan entities" and "Nueres. The description of life support and political institution methods of one of the Nilotic peoples" (Russian translation, 1985). B. Malinovsky formulated his postulate or the initial principle of the functional approach in the following way: "in any type of civilization, any custom, material object, idea and beliefs perform a certain vital function, solve a certain task, represent a necessary part inside the acting whole" (Malinovsky B. 1996).

For A. Radcliffe-Brown functional analysis meant, first of all, the definition of a place and the role of this phenomenon in social structure functioning. "Only when we understand culture as a functioning system," the scientist wrote, "we can foresee the results of any deliberate or an unintentional influence that it exerts on it" (Radcliffe-Brown, 2001). In the process of cultural and anthropological research, the concept of "function" has received two main meanings. The first indicates the role that a certain element of culture performs with respect to the whole, and the second one characterizes the relationship between the parts and the components of culture. The following functions were the subject of the analysis: substantial or supporting function; adaptive function; the function of tradition, religious belief, ritual, and the history of people preservation and replication; the symbolic-sign function of culture; the communicative function of culture; the regulatory function contains the institutional forms of conflict resolution; compensatory function. We should not forget about the influence of early or classic British functionalism on American sociologists and political scientists - T. Parson, R. Merton, D. Easton, G. Almond, and others who in the second half of the 20th century were engaged in the study of political processes and the mechanisms of power in post-traditional and industrial societies. In the late 70's - early 80's, the initiative in the development of the functionalist paradigm of social theory passed to the German researchers Yu. Habermas and N. Luman.

American researchers tried to overcome the extremes and the shortcomings that were, in their opinion, peculiar

to early functionalism in the process of their theory development. Thus, Merton, analyzing the mistakes of his predecessors, identifies three questionable provisions, in his opinion: 1) the postulate of functional unity (standardized social activities or the elements of culture are functional for the entire social or cultural system); 2) the postulate of the universal functionalism of social life (all these social and cultural elements fulfill social functions); 3) the postulate of functional necessity (indispensability), (performing functions of a phenomenon or the objects that are necessary for the life of society) (Merton R.K. 1994). Merton essentially changes the functional approach and offers its codification of concepts and problems or the paradigm of functional analysis in sociology.

As for the first postulate of functional unity, then, according to Merton, it is relatively acceptable for some pre-literate societies. In fact, societies represent different integration degrees (including political one). The difference in the degree of their homogeneity (political and legal regime, for example) can make the shifting of conclusions from one to another very risky. Here, the specification of the socio-political unit that is served by a given social function is required, since this or that phenomenon may not function for the whole system, but only for its part.

The consideration of the second postulate of universal functionalism led Merton to the conclusion that it is necessary to develop a method to determine the net balance-sheet result of particular social phenomenon consequences.

### 3. Main part

One and the same social phenomenon can be functional in one respect, and dysfunctional in another, so it is important for a functionalist analyst to talk about a functional balance. Let's not forget that for Merton the functions are those observable consequences that contribute to the adaptation of a serviced unit or a system. Dysfunctions are those observed effects that reduce adaptation. Non-functional phenomena are those whose consequences are indifferent.

Merton's idea of a "pure balance of the totality of consequences" is of interest for us, since it can help explain the nature of one level of political evolution change to another. If the net balance of the existing socio-political structure turns out to be definitely dysfunctional, then there is a powerful pressure that seeks to change this structure. Upon a certain critical point reaching, this pressure will inevitably lead to more or less predetermined directions of socio-political changes. It turns out that a dysfunctional method of analysis can reveal not only the bases of socio-political stability, but also the potential sources of political change. When these changes go beyond a certain critical point, which can be difficult to determine, a new social system emerges.

The very concept of "historically developed forms," according to the sociologist, suggests that social structures, as a rule, undergo distinct changes. Researchers are left to detect those pressures that produce the changes of various types. Considering the necessity postulate critically, Merton formulates the concept of functional alternatives (functional equivalents or substitutes). In this regard, the problem of phenomenon variability range arises. This range introduces some mobility into a frozen picture of the existing and inevitable. The interdependence of social structure elements limits the choice of alternatives and the possibility of changes. This limiting effect of the structure is called the structural context. For Merton, the main question at this point of reflection is the following one: "To what extent does this structural context limit the range of phenomenon variation in which they can meet functional requirement effectively?" (Merton R.K., 1994). The knowledge of the structural context allows to foresee the most probable directions of social changes. Thus, functional analysis in Merton's theory is closely related to another approach - structural analysis. Both aspects are united by a common research concept and allow to emphasize the study of dynamics, the changes in social and cultural systems. The concept of "explicit" and "latent" functions has a definite methodological potential. Explicit functions are referred to the objective and deliberate consequences of a social action. They contribute to the regulation or the adaptation of the system. Latent functions belong to the category of unintended objective consequences, which were not the part of an intention and were not realized. An analytical distinction between these concepts was introduced in order to exclude the confusion of the conscious motivation of social behavior or subjective relations (interests, goals) with its objective but not realized functional consequences. In both cases, we are talking about the consequences that have an objective character, i.e. existing or manifesting independently of the consciousness and the intentions of separately acting individuals. In the evaluation of the system action functionality two "functional system problems" - the problem of "distribution" (tasks, resources, value objects, etc.) and the problem of "integration" (possible coordination of different parts of the system) play a specifying role. The functions are divided into "mechanisms" - the processes that stabilize the system of action, and the "trends" - the processes that disrupt the equilibrium of a system and lead to changes. These two fundamental principles make the basis of T. Parson's structurally functional theory of social systems. The social system is one of the aspects of an entirely concrete social action system structuring. T. Parsons defines it as a system formed by the states and the processes of social interaction between acting subjects whose properties are not derived from the properties of acting subjects. Its minimal element is not an individual, but a bundle of "status-role", where the status expresses a "positional aspect" and the role expresses a "procedural aspect". The problem Parsons seeks to solve is to explain the functional differentiation of the action subsystems. The main subject of his analysis are the processes that ensure the preservation and the survival of all subsystems of action and the system as a whole. These processes are vital for a system preservation and reproduction as an integrity. He considers them as functional imperatives or functional requirements. Any system is necessary, it must satisfy four functional conditions: adaptation, goal-setting, integration and latency (in the English-language version, AGIL - according to the first letters of the concepts adaptation-goal-integration-latency). Therefore, four subsystems with corresponding functions are formed in the system: adaptation of the system to its environment (adaptation); the definition of the hierarchy of goals to be achieved, and the mobilization of the resources necessary for this (goal-

setting); the provision of the whole system through the internal coordination of its elements (integration); the maintenance of equilibrium and the reproduction of system samples (latency).

The scheme of this "four-function paradigm" is used for the analysis of other systems, for example, the social one, which will appear in this form: the function of adaptation in the social system is implemented by the subsystem of the economy, the function of maintaining the sample - the subsystem of socialization, the goal-setting function is implemented by a political subsystem presupposing the possibility of behavior individual compulsory control, the function of integration - the subsystem of social control, carried out to control the behavior of individuals because of their voluntary loyalty to those groups to which they belong. The complex of social sciences, including political science, explores the social system, both in the microdynamic interactions processes, and in the macrodynamic processes of structural and functional differentiation and integration from different aspects.

T. Parsons names some social systems as societies. Society is a type of social system that has the highest degree of self-sufficiency relative to its environment, including other social systems. Self-sufficiency in relation to the environment means not closure, but the stability of mutual exchange with the environment and the ability of the system to control this interchange in the interests of its functioning. Society, as a system that achieves the highest level of self-sufficiency in relation to the environment, is a societal community. Self-sufficiency presupposes such a level of social structuring, which means the state-formal organization itself. The self-sufficiency of society or the state, according to Parsons, is the function of a balanced combination of control mechanism balanced combination over the society relations with the five environments (the highest reality, cultural systems, personality systems, behavioral organisms and physical-organic environment), as well as of its own internal integration degree (Parsons T. 1993).

This is nothing more than a functionally organized society or a functionally organized state. The political structures of such a society organize collective actions, both on a broad social basis, and on a narrow one, territorially or functionally limited. At a high level of political evolution requires the differentiation of the adult population status by two parameters. The first parameter determines the levels of responsibility for the coordination of collective actions and establishes the institutions of leadership and authority. The second one is with the level of competence, knowledge, etc. and gives more power to professionals. Moreover, Parsons adds the following: "the isolation of a political system from the matrix of the societal community implies the institutionalization of high statuses in both these contexts" (Parsons T. 1993). Let us note in this regard the following methodological aspect of the author's reasoning, in order not to appear in the Parsons' "categorical trap". The concept of "political system" includes (in the light of the political science tradition) the state as its main structural element. If we attach the "social community" to the status of a state-formed society or a state, then in our interpretation (but not in the scholar's reasoning) we find a simple tautology. Parsons represents each unit of the system of action by changing the level of the correlation system as an independent system and analyzes any aspect of this unit in the categories of four-function paradigm. For him, categories mean a necessary set of analytical dimensions, without which it is impossible to study the "system of action", but they (the categories) do not have an ontological meaning (Parsons T. 1969). Let us not forget that Parsons' use of the concept of function sometimes acts as an "analytic aspect of the system of action". There is a certain political and legal regime in the societal community in which the coercive mechanism plays a significant role. An autonomous legal system develops, which is an important indicator of the societal community differentiation. This is explained by the need for an authoritative interpretation of institutionalized regulatory prescriptions. The political-legal regime supports the normative order, and also monitors the behavior within the boundaries of a certain territory. Consequently, the management function includes the responsibility for the territorial unity maintaining of the regulatory order in a state. This functional imperative has two aspects: internal and external one. Internal aspect concerns the conditions of general norm imposing for the performance of necessary functions by various elements of society. External aspect is aimed at destructive interference prevention from outside. The extreme means of a destructive effect prevention is the use of physical force. According to Parsons, the control of the organized use of physical force provided by the unity of management institutions is one of the basic functional needs of the state. Thus, the primary need of a state-formed society is to harmonize the activities of its citizens with regulatory requirements. In other words, the primary functional need of the state is to maintain a uniform regulatory order throughout the territory. The state should have an adequate control over motivational obligations and over the economic and technological complex.

Among the most important structural components of society - values, norms, collective organizations, roles - Parsons attached a special importance to the last component. Adaptation is the primary function of the role in the social system. And among the processes of evolutionary change, the most important from the perspective is the process of adaptive capability enhancement. The indicator of adaptive capabilities is primarily differentiation - the process in which an element, a subsystem, or a set of them is eventually divided into several elements or systems that differ both by the structure and by the functional role within a new system. Each newly separated subsystem should be more adapted to implement its primary function in comparison with the previous form and the previous level of its implementation (function). Parsons calls this process "an adaptive improvement." The processes of differentiation influence the integration of the system directly. Integration is associated with the need to coordinate the actions of a new set of structural elements, and hence functions. Thus, at the appropriate level of professional specialization (in the field of production), a system of power appears that is no longer determined by kinship. An adaptive improvement requires that new specialized abilities do not repeat, do not reproduce the functions of the previous (diffuse) structures. By diffusion we mean an actor's orientation on an object as a whole, and not on the specific elements of this whole. The

process of adaptive opportunity strengthening involves the generalization of values (manifested in the expansion of universal cultural pattern scope that are not specific to most social groups) and the increase of actor membership volume performing the roles in social systems (inclusion).

Social development is understood by T. Parsons as a logical evolution of social systems in the direction of adaptation and self-sufficiency increase. On this path, the subsystems that signify a qualitatively new state of the social system appear successively in any social system. The evolution of these systems is carried out from primitive societies through an intermediate stage to modern societies. The main divider, the marker in the evolutionary stages within its classification is the change in the code of regulatory structures. During the transition from an intermediate to a modern society this is the institutionalization of codes of a regulatory order, the core of which is the system of law.

Let's pay attention to the fact that in the New time the coordinating function / activity of the state took a certain institutional form. S.I. Hessen in his work "The Rule of Law and Socialism" quotes P. Cole's opinion that the coordinating organization has not so much administrative, organizational, managerial or legislative as judicial character. That is, the primacy of judicial practice, which has survived to the present day (with its characteristic adversarial nature), is developed in the establishment of a state-coordinated law and order.

Hessen also notes that a functionally organized state "definitely empowers each functional association to solve all those matters that relate to its function, without any interference in its normative operations by any extraneous body" (Hessen S.I., 1999). He formulates the concept of functional federalism. Within the framework of functional federalism, the state undergoes functional diversification and is defined as "the coordinating organization of society, and its function (state) is ... to represent the completeness of interconnected activities in a functionally separated society" (Hessen S.I. 1999). An interesting interpretation of the further development of functional federalism is provided by V.S. Nersesyants. According to him this development led to the fact that not only and not so much legal proceedings, but also other axiological functions began to structure the institutional field of statehood (Nersesyants V.S. 2000). The content of functions remains unchanged at various stages of state and society development.

Let's note that the Parsonsian characteristic of a functionally-organized state with the use of function differentiation principle corresponds with the functional-method structure by N.S. Rozov. His position is determined by the fact that in the historical process each new phase of society political organization development is not only a more effective way of old function performance, but certainly the emergence of many new functions and the discovery of new opportunities for the development of other structural components of the state. This means a significant update not only and not so much of the private ways of social structure and social institution function performance, but rather an update of the system of functions itself. Both the conceptualization of the functional system of the state and the moment of transition record from one regime (collectively defining one or another historical type of state) to another one by N.S. Rozov are important for us. He notes that "regimes as coherent aggregates of routine processes are conceptualized through the systems of social functions (defining regularity) and social methods (human, social, cultural and material basis of regular routine processes)" (Rozov N.S., 2001). The rise to a new stage in the space of some dominating factor (there are ten of them) is accompanied by clear signs of a significant qualitative change in functionality and greater efficiency. If this happens for all ten factors, then we are dealing with an appropriate regime complex and the class of functional systems. The appearance of a qualitatively new system of functions means the change in the political-legal regime complex. Completing the consideration of the posed issue, it should be noted that in one of his recent studies V.E. Chirkin drew attention to the fact that "the exercise of the state functions is public administration, understood in the broad sense of these words as the diverse activity of all state authorities, including the parliament, the court, other authorities, and not only the managerial administration" (Chirkin V.E. 2001).

#### 4. Conclusions

So, the analysis of various functionalist paradigms will help to reveal an essential, organic aspect of a state-organized society existence. In such a society, functions carry out the homeostatic interconnection of social elements (roles, cultural patterns, norms, regimes, institutions, etc.) between themselves and the whole, as well as a concrete process of adaptation or adaptability as the factor determining the direction and the degree of state development advancement. The analysis of only one sphere of socio-historical reality will clearly be insufficient. Technologies, production relations, culture and other spheres have a causal and a functional connection with political processes and need to be taken into account. A functionally organized state embodies a certain type of activity that satisfies the need for self-preservation and purposeful organization. The change in the system of social functions (in the case of exceeding the critical values of basic functions) leads to the modification or the emergence of a new political and a legal regime. Political-legal regimes are conceptualized thereby through the systems of social functions. A certain political and legal regime sets a corresponding historical type of state in its basis.

## References

1. Jellinek G. (2004). General doctrine of the state. St. Petersburg., p. 245.
2. Lyubashits V.Ya. (1993). General theory of the state. Part 2. Historical types, form, mechanism and the functions of the state. Rostov-on-Don. Philosophical Encyclopedia. (1970). V. 5. M., p. 418.
3. Díaz-Barrios, Jazmín, Morela Pereira-Burgos, and Wendolin Suárez-Amaya. "Gobernanza: una visión desde la teoría administrativa." *Opción* 34.86 (2018): 326-357
4. Khazal, A. W., Sari, A. M., & Jun, W. X. (2016). Asymptotic Properties of MLE in Stochastic Differential Equations with Random Effects in the drift Coefficient. *International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics*, 5(1), 210-218.
5. Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary. (1989). M., p. 718.
6. Malinovsky B. (1996). Magic and Religion // *Religion and Society*. M., p. 46.
7. Radcliffe-Brown A.R. (2001). Method in social anthropology. M., p. 66.
8. Merton R.K. (1994). Explicit and latent functions // *American sociological thought*. M., pp. 386-399.
9. Parsons T. (1993). The concept of society: components and their mutual relations // *Thesis*. V.1. №2. pp. 100-101.
10. Parsons T. (1969). Author's point of view // *Structural and functional analysis in modern sociology*. The information bulletin of the SSA. No. 23 (38). Issue 11. M., p.98.
11. Hessen S.I. (1999). The Rule of Law and Socialism // *Collected Works*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, p. 395.
12. Nersesyants V.S. Legal axiology // *Political-legal centers: history and modernity*. M.: URSS, 2000. pp. 5-30.
13. Rozov N.S. (2001). Towards a justified periodization of world history. // *Structures of history*. Time of peace. Issue 2. Novosibirsk, p.264.
14. Chirkin V.E. The modern state. M., 2001. p. 199.
15. Vorontsov S.A., (2017). Elitogenesis in the political processes of modern Russia, based on sociological (field) research. // Vorontsov S.A., Mamychyev A.Yu., Ponedelkov A.V., Yanguzin A.R., Vildanov H. *Man in India*. V. 97. № 23. pp. 273-284.
16. Lyubashits V., (2017). Sociocultural measurement of institutional and functional characteristics of public-power interactions // Lyubashits V., Mamychyev A., Uvarova G., Artyukhin O. *Man in India*. V. 97. № 23. pp. 461-470.
17. Bytyak, Y. P., Yakovyuk, I. V., Tragniuk, O., Komarova, T. V., & Shestopal, S. S. (2017). The State Sovereignty and Sovereign Rights: the Correlation Problem. *Man in India*, 97(23), 577-588.
18. Mordovtsev A. , Zhinkin S., Mamychyev A., Yakovyuk I., Shestopal S. (2017). Legal Mentality in National Cultural Space: Characteristics of the ERA of Change (Church Schism of the 17th Century). *Man in India*, 97(23), 295-309.
19. Mordovtsev Andrey Yuryevich, Mamychyev Alexey Yurievich, Shestopal Sergey Stanislavovich, (2017). Essential content of Russian legal mentality // *Azimuth of Scientific Research: Economics and Administration*. 2017. V. 6. № 4(21)
20. Shestopal, S. S., Lyubashits, V. Y., Astakhov, V. V., Pismennaya, E. E., Ryazantsev, S. V., Fedulov, A. M., & Barsukov, P. V. (2016). Features of Building Control Systems Sub-Locality in Modern Russia. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(1S), 78-83.